

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is being filed along with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) to place the application in condition for allowance.

In the Final Office Action mailed May 8, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 9-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement; rejected claims 9-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement; rejected claims 9-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention; and rejected claims 9-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,617,750 to Garehime in view of WO 9420809 to O'Dwyer.

Claims 9-14, 16-21, and 36-45 are currently pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 17, cancels claims 15 and 22-35, and adds new claims 36-45 to more clearly define the invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is now moot in light of Applicant's amendment of claim 9 to overcome this rejection. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw this enablement rejection.

The Examiner also rejected claims 9-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is now moot in light of Applicant's amendment of claim 9 to

overcome this rejection. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw this written description rejection.

The Examiner further rejected claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is now moot in light of Applicant's amendment of claim 9 to overcome this rejection. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw this 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection.

Amended claim 9 recites, among other things, "a sensor system including a plurality of sensors located throughout the land area for detecting intrusions in a plurality of corresponding zones within the land area" and "a firing control circuit that receives signals from the sensor system and triggers the weapon so that projectiles are fired into one or more of the zones in which an intrusion is detected." Support for these amendments to claim 9 may be found, for example, in the specification at page 3, line 30 - page 5, line 9. New claim 36 recites a method of targeting intrusions on a land area including, among other things, "locating a sensor system in the area having a plurality of zones defined by respective sensors . . . detecting an intrusion in one or more of the zones via the sensor system . . . [and] sending a signal from the sensor system to the firing control circuit resulting from said detected intrusion." Support for these amendments to claim 9, and for new claim 36, may be found, for example, in the specification at page 3, line 30 - page 5, line 9.

New claim 45 recites, among other things, "a box containing a plurality of barrels in parallel orientation, each barrel containing a sensor and a series of projectiles for

sequential firing; and a firing control circuit which fires the sensors from the barrels into the land area to define zones for detection of intrusions.” Support for new claim 45 may be found, for example, in the specification at page 6, lines 12-17.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejection of claims 9-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Garehime in view of O’Dwyer. The Examiner contends that “Garehime discloses a defense system for an area comprising: at least one optics sensor 128; multiple barrel gun 126; a firing controller (the operator); and video console 26.” (Office Action at 4.) The Examiner concedes that “Garehime does not disclose each barrel being loaded with multiple projectiles that are sequentially selected and fired” but argues that “O’Dwyer discloses such a barrel.” (Office Action at 4.) Applicant submits, however, that the combination of Garehime and O’Dwyer fails to teach or suggest every limitation of amended claim 9, and therefore, amended claim 9 is not obvious over Garehime in view of O’Dwyer.

Garehime fails to teach or suggest “a sensor system including a plurality of sensors located throughout the land area for detecting intrusions in a plurality of corresponding zones within the land area” (emphasis added), as recited in amended claim 9. In particular, Garehime does not disclose a plurality of sensor used to detect intrusions in a plurality of corresponding zones within a land area, as recited in amended claim 9, described in the specification, and depicted in the application drawings (see Fig. 2, for example.) Garehime specifically discloses that a “further object of the invention is to provide a remotely controlled surveillance and weapon system for the protection of aircraft (interior) and other confined regions.” (Col. 4, lines 14-16.) The Examiner even points out that “Garehime discloses that the invention can

be used in banks or prisons that are located on the land,” however, such confined regions differ from the open “land area” having “a plurality of corresponding zones,” as recited in amended claim 9 and depicted in Figs. 1 and 2, for example.

Moreover, Garehime does not teach or suggest “a firing control circuit that receives signals from the sensor system and triggers the weapon so that projectiles are fired into one or more of the zones in which an intrusion is detected” (emphasis added), as recited in amended claim 9. The Examiner concedes as much by arguing that Garehime teaches “a firing controller (the operator).” (Office Action at 4.) The operator in Garehime cannot be considered the same as the firing control circuit recited in amended claim 9.

Applicant respectfully submits that O'Dwyer fails to cure the above-identified deficiencies of Garehime. Accordingly, Applicant submits that amended claim 9 is not obvious over the applied references and is therefore allowable. Moreover, claims 10-14 and 16-21 are allowable at least due to their dependence from amended claim 9.

To the extent the Examiner’s 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 9-21 applies to new claim 36, Applicant respectfully submits that the applied references do not teach or suggest every limitation of new claim 36. For example, Garehime fails to teach or suggest a method of targeting intrusions on a land area including “locating a sensor system in the area having a plurality of zones defined by respective sensors . . . locating at least one weapon having multiple barrels trained on respective zones . . . containing multiple projectiles . . . fired by a firing control circuit; detecting an intrusion in one or more of the zones via the sensor system; sending a signal from the sensor system to the firing control circuit resulting from said detected intrusion; and triggering the weapon

through the firing control circuit to fire one or more projectiles into each of the zones in which the intrusion is detected,” as recited in new claim 36. Moreover, O'Dwyer fails to cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of Garehime. Accordingly, Applicant submits that new claim 36 is not obvious over the applied references and is therefore allowable. Moreover, claims 37-44 are allowable at least due to their dependence from new claim 36.

To the extent the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 9-21 applies to new claim 45, Applicant respectfully submits that the applied references do not teach or suggest every limitation of new claim 45. For example, Garehime fails to teach or suggest “a box containing a plurality of barrels . . . each barrel containing a sensor and a series of projectiles for sequential firing; and a firing control circuit which fires the sensors from the barrels into the land area to define zones for detection of intrusions, and which fires one or more projectiles from the barrels into the zones on receiving signals from the respective sensors.” Moreover, O'Dwyer fails to cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of Garehime. Accordingly, Applicant submits that new claim 45 is not obvious over the applied references and is therefore allowable.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge  
any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 7, 2006

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Aaron L. Parker  
Reg. No. 50,785